UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/758,054	01/15/2004	Rahul Garg	1864.003US1	5115

40317 7590 10/02/2009
GLOBAL IP SERVICES, PLLC
10 CRESTWOOD LANE
NASHUA, NH 03062

EXAMINER	
FLORES, LEON	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2611	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/02/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

pnama@globalipservices.com
contact@globalipservices.com
neha@globalipservices.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/758,054	GARG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	LEON FLORES	2611	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *27 March 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☒ Claim(s) *7,8,18,21,22,25 and 26* is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-5,9-16,19,20,23 and 24* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *6, 17* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed on 3/27/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant asserts that *"Wang describes an L-rake receiver in that the channel taps are assigned according to the channel conditions. In contrast, independent claims 1, 5, 15, 19 and 23 recite an adaptive Rake receiver that can be used to compensate for signal distortions with the use of non-uniform tap delay filters. The non-uniform tap delay filters are used to output an adaptively channel matched signal for decoding".*

The examiner respectfully disagrees. The reference of Wang does teach a non-uniformly spaced LMMSE receiver. Such a receiver is a more general version of an L-rake receiver. The LMMSE filter filters the received signal with the filter-tap locations determined by tap selector and filter coefficients determined by weight calculator. (See fig. 5: 420 & ¶ 70) Furthermore, one skilled in the art would know that the function of a LMMSE filter is to compensate for channel distortion (fig. 5 "filtered signal") prior to performing signal extraction. (decoding)

Applicant finally asserts that *"independent claims 1, 5, 15, 19, and 23 recite the adaptable non-uniform Rake filter including multiple non-uniform tap delay filters that extract delay information from each selected Rake filter coefficient and to configure structure of the multiple non-uniform tap delay filters. Support for this can be found in page 2, lines 3-5 and in claims 1, 5, 15, 19 and 23. Independent claims 1, 5, 15, 19 and 23 should thus be found allowable, and such action is respectfully requested".*

The examiner respectfully disagrees. The reference of Wang does teach a non-uniformly spaced LMMSE receiver. (¶ 70 “non-uniformly spaced LMMSE receiver”) Such a receiver is a more general version of an L-rake receiver. The LMMSE filter filters the received signal with the filter-tap locations determined by tap selector and filter coefficients determined by weight calculator. (See fig. 5: 420 & ¶ 70) And one skilled in the art would know that the selection of the tap locations gives us some delay information. (See ¶ 67 “correlation timing determined by tap selector”) Furthermore, the reference of Wang also suggests that selecting fewer taps reduces the receiver complexity and improves the numerical stability (See ¶ 138). And one skilled in the art would know that by selecting fewer taps or more taps would change the configuration of the filter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

> 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
> 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.

3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. **Claims (1-4, 5, 15, 19-20, 23-24) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang. (US Publication 2005/0152486 A1)**

Re claim 1, Wang discloses a Rake receiver comprising: a Rake filter coefficient estimator that computes channel coefficients of each received channel component (See fig. 5: 402 & ¶ 70), wherein the Rake filter coefficient estimator computes a Rake filter coefficient for each estimated channel coefficient (See fig. 5: 406 & ¶ 70).

But the reference of Wang fails to explicitly that wherein the Rake filter coefficient estimator selects one or more Rake filter coefficients from the estimated channel coefficients based on channel characteristics.

However, the reference of Wang does teach that the L-rake receiver assigns the channel taps according to the channel conditions. (See ¶ 69) Furthermore, tap selector selects the filter-tap locations based on the composite CIR provided by channel estimator, and the weights calculator computes the filter coefficients using the output of tap selector. (See ¶ 70)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art to have incorporated this feature into the system of Wang, in the manner as claimed, for the benefit of computing the filter coefficients of the receiver.

The reference of Wang discloses the limitations as claimed above, except he fails to explicitly teach an adaptable non-uniform Rake filter including multiple non-

uniform tap delay filters to extract delay information from each selected Rake filter coefficient and to configure structure of the multiple non-uniform tap delay filters.

However, reference of Wang does teach a non-uniformly spaced LMMSE receiver. (¶ 70 “non-uniformly spaced LMMSE receiver”) Such a receiver is a more general version of an L-rake receiver. The LMMSE filter filters the received signal with the filter-tap locations determined by tap selector and filter coefficients determined by weight calculator. (See fig. 5: 420 & ¶ 70) And one skilled in the art would know that the selection of the tap locations gives us some delay information. (See ¶ 67 “correlation timing determined by tap selector”) Furthermore, the reference of Wang also suggests that selecting fewer taps reduces the receiver complexity and improves the numerical stability (See ¶ 138). And one skilled in the art would know that by selecting fewer taps or more taps would change the configuration of the filter.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art to have incorporated this feature into the system of Wang, in the manner as claimed, for the benefit of reducing the receiver complexity and would keep the power consumption at minimum. (See ¶s 138 & 140-141)

Re claim 2, the reference of Wang fails to explicitly teach that wherein the Rake filter coefficient estimator selects the one or more Rake filter coefficients based on channel components having a most signal energy.

However, the reference of Wang does suggest the teaching of selecting channel taps with large energy. (See ¶s 87-94)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art to have incorporated this feature into the system of Wang, in the manner as claimed, for the benefit of improving the performance of the receiver.

Re claim 3, the reference of Wang fails to explicitly teach that wherein the Rake filter coefficient estimator selects a Rake coefficient having the most signal energy as a primary Rake filter component from the one or more Rake filter coefficients, wherein the Rake filter coefficient estimator applies a weighted criteria for selection of Rake coefficients corresponding to channel components occurring before and after the primary Rake filter component.

However, the reference of Wang does suggest the teaching of choosing the first tap with the maximum energy always maximizes, or nearly maximizes equation 9. (See ¶ 82) Furthermore, Wang also teaches a heuristic search that first pre-selects the channel taps in the span of the CIR to capture the signal energy. The heuristic search then proceeds to place additional channel taps at certain distances of the pre-selected taps to suppress the interference. One skilled in the art would know that these additional taps that are located at a certain distance from the main lobe (having the highest peak), and that contribute to interference, are the pre-cursor (before) and post-cursor. (after)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art to have incorporated this feature into the system of Wang, in the manner as claimed, for the

benefit of improving the performance of the receiver.

Re claim 4, the reference of Wang further discloses that wherein the Rake receiver applies the weighted criteria based on knowledge of a specific scenario of a Rake receiver application. (See ¶ 103 “to suppress interference”)

Re claim 5, Wang discloses a Rake receiver for receiving one or more channel components from a transmitter and outputting a channel matched signal comprising: a channel coefficient module that estimates channel coefficients of each received channel component from the transmitter (See fig. 5: 402 & ¶ 70); a Rake filter coefficient module that computes a Rake filter coefficient for each estimated channel coefficient. (See fig. 5: 406 & ¶ 70)

But the reference of Wang fails to explicitly that a Rake coefficient selector that selects one or more Rake filter coefficients from the computed Rake filter based on channel characteristics.

However, the reference of Wang does teach that the L-rake receiver assigns the channel taps according to the channel conditions. (See ¶ 69) Furthermore, tap selector selects the filter-tap locations based on the composite CIR provided by channel estimator, and the weights calculator computes the filter coefficients using the output of tap selector. (See ¶ 70)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art to have incorporated this feature into the system of Wang, in the manner as claimed, for the benefit of computing the filter coefficients of the receiver.

The reference of Wang discloses the limitations as claimed above, except he fails to explicitly teach an adaptable non-uniform Rake filter that extracts delay information from each selected Rake filter coefficient on a real time basis and configures structure of non-uniform tap delay filters, and wherein the adaptable non-uniform Rake filter combines the one or more channel components with associated delay information using the configured adaptable non-uniform Rake filter and outputs the adaptively channel matched signal.

However, the reference of Wang does teach a non-uniformly spaced LMMSE receiver. (¶ 70 “non-uniformly spaced LMMSE receiver”) Such a receiver is a more general version of an L-rake receiver. The LMMSE filter filters the received signal with the filter-tap locations determined by tap selector and filter coefficients determined by weight calculator. (See fig. 5: 420 & ¶ 70) And one skilled in the art would know that the selection of the tap locations gives us some delay information. (See ¶ 67 “correlation timing determined by tap selector”) Furthermore, the reference of Wang also suggests that selecting fewer taps reduces the receiver complexity and improves the numerical stability (See ¶ 138). And one skilled in the art would know that by selecting fewer taps or more taps would change the configuration of the filter.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art to have incorporated this feature into the system of Wang, in the manner as claimed, for the

benefit of reducing the receiver complexity and would keep the power consumption at minimum. (See ¶s 138 & 140-141)

Re claim 15, Wang discloses a system comprising: a bus; a processor coupled to the bus; a memory coupled to the processor; a network interface coupled to the processor and the memory (See fig. 1 & ¶ 5. Furthermore, these features are well known in a communication system.); and a Rake receiver coupled to the network interface and the processor, wherein the Rake receiver further comprising: a channel coefficient module estimates channel coefficients of each received channel component from a transmitter (See fig. 5: 402 & ¶ 70); a Rake filter coefficient module computes a Rake filter coefficient for each estimated channel coefficient (See fig. 5: 406 & ¶ 70);

But the reference of Wang fails to explicitly that a Rake coefficient selector selects one or more Rake filter coefficients from the estimated channel coefficients based on channel characteristics.

However, the reference of Wang does teach that the L-rake receiver assigns the channel taps according to the channel conditions. (See ¶ 69) Furthermore, tap selector selects the filter-tap locations based on the composite CIR provided by channel estimator, and the weights calculator computes the filter coefficients using the output of tap selector. (See ¶ 70)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art to have incorporated this feature into the system of Wang, in the manner as claimed, for the benefit of computing the filter coefficients of the receiver.

The reference of Wang discloses the limitations as claimed above, except he fails to explicitly teach an adaptable non-uniform Rake filter extracts delay information from each selected Rake filter coefficient and to configure structure of non-uniform tap delay filters, and wherein the adaptable non-uniform Rake filter to combine the one or more channel components with associated delay information using the configured adaptable non-uniform Rake filter and to output the channel matched signal.

However, the reference of Wang does teach a non-uniformly spaced LMMSE receiver. (¶ 70 "non-uniformly spaced LMMSE receiver") Such a receiver is a more general version of an L-rake receiver. The LMMSE filter filters the received signal with the filter-tap locations determined by tap selector and filter coefficients determined by weight calculator. (See fig. 5: 420 & ¶ 70) And one skilled in the art would know that the selection of the tap locations gives us some delay information. (See ¶ 67 "correlation timing determined by tap selector") Furthermore, the reference of Wang also suggests that selecting fewer taps reduces the receiver complexity and improves the numerical stability (See ¶ 138). And one skilled in the art would know that by selecting fewer taps or more taps would change the configuration of the filter.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art to have incorporated this feature into the system of Wang, in the manner as claimed, for the benefit of reducing the receiver complexity and would keep the power consumption at minimum. (See ¶s 138 & 140-141)

Claim 19 is a method claim corresponding to apparatus claim 1. Hence, the steps performed in method claim 19 would have necessitated the elements in apparatus claim 1. Therefore, claim 19 has been analyzed and rejected w/r to claim 1 above.

Claim 20 has been analyzed and rejected w/r to claim 3 above.

Claim 23 has been analyzed and rejected w/r to claim 5 above.

Claim 24 has been analyzed and rejected w/r to claim 3 above.

4. **Claims (9-14, 16) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang. (US Publication 2005/0152486 A1) in view of Teder et al. (hereinafter Teder) (US Patent 5,544,156)**

Re claim 9, Wang discloses a Rake receiver using an adaptable non-uniform tap delay filters comprising: a channel coefficient module estimates channel coefficients of each received channel component from a transmitter (See fig. 5: 402 & ¶ 70); a Rake filter coefficient module computes a Rake filter coefficient for each estimated channel coefficient (See fig. 5: 406 & ¶ 70).

But the reference of Wang fails to explicitly that a Rake coefficient selector selects one or more Rake filter coefficients from the computed Rake filter based on channel characteristics.

However, the reference of Wang does teach that the L-rake receiver assigns the channel taps according to the channel conditions. (See ¶ 69) Furthermore, tap selector selects the filter-tap locations based on the composite CIR provided by channel

estimator, and the weights calculator computes the filter coefficients using the output of tap selector. (See ¶ 70)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art to have incorporated this feature into the system of Wang, in the manner as claimed, for the benefit of computing the filter coefficients of the receiver.

The reference of Wang discloses the limitations as claimed above, except he fails to explicitly teach an adaptable non-uniform Rake filter extracts delay information from each selected Rake filter coefficient on a real time basis and to configure structure of non-uniform tap delay filters, and wherein the adaptable non-uniform Rake filter to combine the one or more channel components with associated delay information using the configured adaptable non-uniform Rake filter and to output a adaptively channel matched signal.

However, the reference of Wang does teach a non-uniformly spaced LMMSE receiver. (¶ 70 “non-uniformly spaced LMMSE receiver”) Such a receiver is a more general version of an L-rake receiver. The LMMSE filter filters the received signal with the filter-tap locations determined by tap selector and filter coefficients determined by weight calculator. (See fig. 5: 420 & ¶ 70) And one skilled in the art would know that the selection of the tap locations gives us some delay information. (See ¶ 67 “correlation timing determined by tap selector”) Furthermore, the reference of Wang also suggests that selecting fewer taps reduces the receiver complexity and improves the numerical stability (See ¶ 138). And one skilled in the art would know that by selecting fewer taps or more taps would change the configuration of the filter.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art to have incorporated this feature into the system of Wang, in the manner as claimed, for the benefit of reducing the receiver complexity and would keep the power consumption at minimum. (See ¶s 138 & 140-141)

The reference of Wang discloses the limitations as claimed above, except he fails to explicitly teach a demodulator to receive the adaptively channel matched signal and to output a decoded signal.

However, Teder does. (See figs 1-2 & 4 & col. 5, line 34 - col. 6, line 46) Teder discloses a rake receiver comprising a channel estimator and a pair of rake demodulators. Furthermore, demodulators are well known components in rake receiver. And they are mainly used to decode/extract the information from received signal.

Therefore, taking the combined teachings of Wang and Teder as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art to have incorporated this feature into the system of Wang, in the manner as claimed and as taught by Teder, for the benefit of extracting the information from the received signal, as is well in the art.

Re claim 10, the combination of Wang and Teder fails to explicitly that wherein the adaptable non-uniform Rake filter configures register structures of the non-uniform tap delay filters.

The reference of Wang also suggests that selecting fewer taps reduces the receiver complexity and improves the numerical stability (See ¶ 138). And one skilled in

the art would know that by selecting fewer taps or more taps would change the configuration of the filter.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art to have incorporated this feature into the system of Wang, as modified by Teder, in the manner as claimed, for the benefit of reducing the receiver complexity and would keep the power consumption at minimum. (See ¶s 138 & 140-141)

Re claim 11, the combination of Wang and Teder further discloses that wherein the adaptable non-uniform Rake filter configures structure of multiplier bank of the non-uniform tap delay filters. (This claim has been analyzed and rejected w/r to claim 10 above.

Claim 12 has been analyzed and rejected w/r to claim 9 above.

Claim 13 has been analyzed and rejected w/r to claim 10 above.

Claim 14 has been analyzed and rejected w/r to claim 11 above.

Re claim 16, the reference of Wang fails to teach a demodulator to receive the channel matched signal and to output a decoded signal.

However, Teder does. (See figs 1-2 & 4 & col. 5, line 34 - col. 6, line 46) Teder discloses a rake receiver comprising a channel estimator and a pair of rake demodulators. Furthermore, demodulators are well known components in rake

receiver. And they are mainly used to decode/extract the information from received signal.

Therefore, taking the combined teachings of Wang and Teder as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art to have incorporated this feature into the system of Wang, in the manner as claimed and as taught by Teder, for the benefit of extracting the information from the received signal, as is well in the art.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims (7-8, 18, 21-22, 25-26) are allowed.

6. Claims (6, 17) are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LEON FLORES whose telephone number is (571)270-1201. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7-5pm Alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Payne can be reached on 571-272-3024. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/L. F./
Examiner, Art Unit 2611
September 18, 2009

/David C. Payne/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2611